

REMARKS

Applicants have the following response to the Office Action of December 17, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 under 35 USC §102(b)¹ as being anticipated by US 6,366,025 (Yamada). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, independent Claim 1 of the present application recites that ‘at least one wiring interposed between the insulator and the anode.’ It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Yamada.

In the Office Action, the Examiner, however, contends that Yamada shows an insulator as the unlabeled substrate in Fig. 6b, an anode at 161 and a wiring “via connecting anode and 43s.” Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation by the Examiner. More specifically, the alleged “connecting” part that the Examiner cites as a wiring is merely part of anode 161 while 43s is the source region. Hence, this is not a wiring and does not read on Claim 1.

In order to make this distinction clear, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that the wiring is not part of the anode. As Yamada clearly shows this alleged “connecting” part is part of the anode, Yamada cannot disclose or suggest the device of amended Claim 1. Hence, independent Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Yamada, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

¹ This appears to be a typographical error as this appears to be a rejection under 35 USC 102(e), as Yamada is not prior art to the present application under 35 USC 102(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 3, 13-16, 18 and 30-58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In particular, independent Claims 13, 34, 39, 44, and 49 all recite “first wiring and second wiring interposed between the insulator and the anode.” As explained above, Yamada does not disclose or suggest this feature. In order to make this distinction clearer, Applicants are amending independent Claims 13, 34, 39, 44, and 49 to recite “wherein the first wiring and the second wiring are not part of the anode.”

In addition, the claims require that the first and second edge of the anode extend in the same direction as that of the anode. In contrast, the alleged first and second edges, cited by the Examiner in the Office Action, in Yamada extend in a different direction.

As Yamada clearly does not disclose or suggest these features, independent Claims 13, 34, 39, 44, and 49, and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Yamada, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in a condition for allowance, and it is requested that it be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: *April 18, 2005*


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500